DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 192 574 FL 011 706

AUTHOR Koehler, Virginia, Comp.
TITLE Teaching as a Linguistic Process. Mid-Project Research Report.
INSTITUTION National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 58p.; Prepared through the Program on Teaching and Instruction.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Students; Class Organization; *Classroom Communication; Cognitive Processes; *Communication Research; Communication Skills; Communicative Competence (Languages); Discourse Analysis; Elementary Education; Ethnic Groups; Ethnography; *Research Methodology; *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

Investigators wrote proposals for research on the nature and learning of communicative processes in the elementary classroom. Three questions were addressed: (1) What is the nature of communication in the classroom? (2) How do students acquire the rules of classroom discourse? (3) What is the effect of inadequate learning of classroom discourse rules? Abstracts of eight federally-funded projects on the topic and two commissioned papers are included here. The first, "A Summary of the Research Area: Methodology and Substantive Issues," by Louis A. Gomes, suggests that successful research methodology should be shared to benefit other researchers. In "Practical Implications of the Research," Marie E. Shiels-D'Jouadi examines each project in terms of its implications for the "educational practitioner." The degree of attention to practical areas in the projects varies from extensive to minimal. It is suggested that expectations for research, basic or applied, should be made clear by the funding agencies. (PJM)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED192574

# TEACHING AS A LINGUISTIC PROCESS

## MID-PROJECT RESEARCH REPORT

Virginia Koehler
Program on Teaching and
Instruction
Teaching and Learning Program
National Institute of Education

FL011706

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Dr. Pisaro
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| Chapter | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| I. | Preface - Dr. Virginia Koehler | 1 |
| II. | Abstracts | 2 |
| | Bilingualism and Bilingual Education in the Puerto Rican Community | 2 |
| | Ethno-Linguistic Study of Classroom Discourse | 3 |
| | A Comparative Ethnography of Children's Communicative Strategies | 4 |
| | Children's Discourse in Cooperative Didactic Interaction: Developmental Patterns in Effective Learning | 5 |
| | Service-Like Events During Individual Work Time and Their Contributions to the Nature of the Rules for Classroom Communication | 6 |
| | Participant Perspectives of Classroom Discourse | 7 |
| | Social and Cultural Organizations of Interaction in Classrooms of Bilingual Teachers | 8 |
| | The Effect of Differential Classroom Organization on the Learning of Classroom Discourse Rules and Cognitive Content | 9 |
| III. | Major Papers | |
| | A Summary of the Research Area: Methodology and Substantive Issues Louis A. Gomes | 10 |
| | Practical Implications of the Research Marie E. Shiels-D'Jouadi with Comments by: Hugh Mehan & Robert Carasco | 24 |
| IV. | Research Personnel | |
| | Paper Presenters | 51 |
| | Panel Members | 53 |
| | Other Experts and Guests | 54 |

CHAPTER I

## PREFACE

In 1977, a grants competition was held on the subject of Teaching as a Linguistic Process. Investigators were invited to submit proposals on the nature and learning of communicative processes in the classroom at the elementary level through increased understanding of language use in school settings, including such factors as the nature and learning of classroom language rules, cultural differences in language use, and student/teacher interactions that require social or referential comprehension.

Investigators were asked to consider the following questions: What is the nature of communication in the classroom? How do students acquire the rules of classroom discourse? What are the effects of inadequate learning of classroom discourse rules?

Eight projects received funding (See abstracts section, pages 2-10).

The purpose of the Mid-Project Research Conference on Teaching as a Linguistic Process was to bring together the principal investigators, National Institute of Education personnel, original grants announcement panelists and other selected outside practitioners and experts to review the progress of the eight Teaching and Instruction Division projects at the midpoint of their contract period. The conference was held in July 1979, at the Holiday Inn South in Fredericksburg, Virginia. During the two and one half days, ten plenary sessions were held: eight were major paper presentations of project progress; and two were panels organized to aid the development and writing of major papers which were to reflect the work of the conference.

In this report of the Teaching as a Linguistic Process Mid-Project Research Conference, the abstracts of the eight research projects have been provided as well as the two major commissioned papers. Copies of individual mid-project reports have been reproduced and may be obtained from me at the National Institute of Education, 1200-19th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20208.

I would like to thank all of the participants for contributing to a worthwhile conference. In addition, I commend Dr. Samuel Pisaro of the Teaching and Instruction staff for his sensitive and detailed management of the meetings and commissioned reports.

Virginia Koehler

CHAPTER II: ABSTRACTS



**Project**: Bilingualism and Bilingual Education in the Puerto Rican Community

**Principal Investigators**: John Attinasi/Shana Poplack/Pedro Pedraza

**Institution**: Center for Puerto Rican Studies

**Funding**: FY '78 - $41,325
FY '79 - $35,475

**NIE Project Monitor**: Marcia Whiteman

---

The over-all goals of this study are to develop more precise knowledge of linguistic norms and resources of the bilingual Puerto Rican community which will serve as a basis for a realistic and effective educational policy. The study will proceed upon the basis of previous exploratory work done by the investigators in the East Harlem community. They will do a sociolinguistic analysis of Spanish and English and an ethnographic analysis of classroom languages.

This research will be carried out in close touch with the legal and political developments in bilingual education, so that it will be continually oriented to the most important issues that effect the community during a period of rapid social change. According to the investigators it is well known that the language situation of the Puerto Rican community in mainland cities has been recognized as a major cause of the failure of the school systems to provide an adequate education for Puerto Rican children. However, in spite of previous legal and community pressures to provide bilingual and bicultural programs to solve this problem, these programs have not yet been informed by the needs of the bilingual child, and lack the necessary ethnographic and sociolinguistic knowledge of the factors determining language choice, language change, language use, and language learning in the Puerto Rican community. The investigators feel that the answers to the questions they have formulated will form a complex pattern of behavior that will largely determine the success or failure of the educational process, and of bilingual education in particular. In the past, many educators have approached these questions as if answers depended entirely on the individual capacities of each child. Sociolinguistic research has already indicated that the answers are the result of patterned ways of speaking that have evolved over long periods of time. The task of socio-linguistic research is to analyze these patterns and trace changes now in progress, so that they can be seen as resources rather than obstacles to the educational process.

**Project:** Ethno-Linguistic Study of Classroom Discourse

**Principal Investigator:** Dell Hymes

**Institution:** University of Pennsylvania

**Funding:** FY '78 - $16,000

**NIE Project Monitor:** Marcia Whiteman

---

The principal investigator will undertake to analyze and sythesize the wide variety of systems currently being used for the analysis of classroom discourse. He will attempt to integrate these results into existing theories, and pursue further development of promising advances in linguistics and core disciplines. There is a great deal to be brought together and considered, much of it unpublished. The investigator feels he can accomplish this task because of his experience with analysis and synthesis of research in linguistic inquiry of many kinds, and personal acquaintance with the development of a number of approaches to discourse now in use.

The findings of studies of classroom discourse can be placed and assessed in terms of the following questions:

1. What range of components of speech events is considered?

2. What range of instances of particular componedta is considered?

3. What range of meanings (purposes, functions) is considered?
   And, placing speech in the context of communication as a whole,

4. (a) What range of modalities, structures, elements of communicative conduct is considered?

   (b) What range of levels is analyzed?

5. What range of communicative conduct provides the basis for the interpretation of classroom discourse?

While this research does not itself deal with implementation, it does have implications for the training of teachers, improvement of instruction, assessment of students, and evaluation of new programs. These findings can be brought to the attention of teachers as an aid in dealing with particular difficulties. The perspective of ethnolinguistics can become an element in the teacher's and administrator's conception of his or her role.

**Project**: Language at School and Home: A comparative Ethnography of Children's Communicative Strategies

**Principal Investigators**: Herbert Simons/John Gumperz

**Institution**: University of California, Berkeley

**Funding**: FY '78 - $84,879
Fy '79 - $89,403

**NIE Project Monitor**: Esther Perry

---

The purpose of this study is to (a) develop ways of looking at classroom interaction and communication in the home; (b) explain what is learned in the classroom on the basis of the continuities and discontinuities between classroom, playground and home communication strategies.

The goals of the study are four-fold:

1) to develop ways of looking at classroom interaction that a) account for differential learning by providing an insight intohow what is said and done in the classroom influences the child's view of the learning process or the goals of education, b) how the classroom environment can provide a distorted view of the content to be learned and so served to stifle motivation to learn over time;

2) to develop ways of looking at the home communicative environment so the investigators can explore a) how the classroom discourse patterns differ from or are similar to those the child builds up before coming to school, b) how mismatch in discourse understanding between home experience and that in the classroom can lead to miscommunication;

3) to study the child as a total person in the school, in both peer relations in the playground as well as in the classroom, so that a full range of the child's communication potentialities for classroom work can be judged;

4) to provide a basis for the future development of teacher training procedures which could give teachers an understanding of their classroom environment.

The investigators feel this study will increase understanding of the communication strategies used in the classroom. They feel it will also provide a set of diagnostic episodes that can be used as a basis for teacher training.

Project: Children's Discourse in Cooperative Didactic Interaction: Developmental Patterns in Effective Learning

Principal Investigator: Catherine R. Cooper

Institution: University of Texas, Austin

Funding: FY '78 - $34,967
FY '79 - $35,201

NIE Project Monitor: Esther Perry

---

The purpose of this project is to study the processes of children's communicatic as they participate in two common peer learning contexts: cooperative and instructional. In a cooperative learning situation, pairs of children have an equal amount of information concerning the problem at hand. In an instructional situation, one child has the information the other needs in order to solve the problem. While many investigators are tracing the development of children's discourse from a developmental-descriptive perspective, others have investigated the degree to which peer interaction enhances cognitive growth, but without specifying the characteristics of effective interaction. The proposed study represents an integration of these two concerns by detailing how children communicate in learning situations and what aspects of their interaction facilitate that process.

Given the increasing reliance on the peer group as a setting for classroom learning, and the theoretical importance of peer interaction in accounts of intellectual development, the careful description of the characteristics of effective peer collaboration is essential.

The principal investigator will focus on identifying the discourse characteristics of children who are most effective in each activity. In addition, she will examine individual differences according to age, sex, ethnic group, and physical setting. The investigator will videotape pairs of children in each of the two learning situations. The study involves 100 pairs of children from kindergarten and second grade, with equal numbers of boys and girls at each age, interacting in a focussed setting. In this study the sequence of speech acts to be examined includes attention focussing, questioning, directing, commenting, responding, and evaluation.

This work will contribute to the basic understanding of children's discourse and to the teaching of young children. By assessing the impact of discourse on cognitive achievement, and examining patterns of individual differences in effectiveness, it will provide both a sequential model of discourse in children's learning and a differentiated, positive view of the assets of each group observed, by identifying which of their existing communication skills contribute to effective learning.

**Project**: Service-Like Events During Individual Work Time and Their Contributions to the Nature of the Rules for Classroom Communication

**Principal Investigator**: Marilyn Merrit

**Institution**: Center for Applied Linguistics

**Funding**: FY '78 - $68,000
FY '79 - $14,000

**NIE Project Monitor**: Marcia Whiteman

---

This study will investigate the nature of the rules governing classroom communication. Specifically, it will attempt to find out how children go about seeking information from their teachers and classmates in such a way that social relationships are maintained or enhanced. It will also investigate how rules for this type of classroom communication relate to existing research and to existing rules of general communication.

The investigator will use video-taped and audio-taped data drawn from middle class, elementary open classrooms (nursery through third grade) over the course of one year. She will use prior analyses of this data as a basis for a general statement about the nature of classroom discourse rules. Specific procedures and findings of that data will be important for this study.

One of the most important concerns of the American educational system is that of equalizing opportunity for learning and standards for evaluation. In recent years, interest in studies of classroom communication have burgeoned and suggest that basic descriptive research about the nature of classroom discourse will have important implications for these concerns. The proposed study of individual work time events is especially appropriate to these needs for at least three reasons. First of all, very little descriptive work has attended to individual work time activities and virtually none have investigated the kind of "event" that is proposed in this study. Secondly, the study of classroom communication during individual work time highlights social meaning. Because children's interaction during this "time" involves initiation of verbal exchange, a child must learn communication rules which regulate conversational readiness with another child. Thirdly, the events to be studied will involve both social meaning and cognitive meaning. Although it is known that children often ask questions in order to get social attention, in many cases it seems clear that the child is motivated to initiate an exchange in order to get academic facts.

Finally, it should be noted that this study will not only tell more about the nature of the rules of classroom discourse, but will have wider implications. As a result of having five grade levels under analysis, and five points in time for each grade level, it is anticipated that inferences will be made about the acquisition of these rules. Further, it is anticipated that a variation in knowledge of these rules among children of the same grade level may be found. This may have important implications for multi-cultural educational settings.

Project: Participant Perspectives of Classroom Discourse

Principal Investigators: Morton Tenenberg/Greta Morine-Dershimer

Institution: California State University, Hayward

Funding: FY '78 - $74,842
FY '79 $83,017
FY '80 $29,648

NIE Project Monitor: Kent Viehoever

---

The investigators feel that there is a need for further research on teaching as a linguistic process, particularly research which would help children and teachers, who are the participants in classroom discourse, to understand each other more fully. They state that it is clear that the consequences of miscommunication can be bad for children, both intellectually and socially. Miscommunication can occur with regard to either referential meanings or social meanings of classroom conversation. This study will investigate participant perspectives on the nature of communication in the classroom, describe pupil conceptions of the differences between discourse in the classroom, at home, and on the playground, examine the correspondence between pupil and teacher conceptions of the rules of classroom discourse, and compare participant conceptions to those of a sociolinguistic specialist in analysis of classroom discourse. In addition, the study will examine the speed of pupil acquisition of the rules of classroom discourse, with particular attention to pupil differences in cultural background, academic ability, and grade level, and to teacher-perceived differences in pupils' communicative behavior in the classroom. Finally, the study will investigate the relationship between teacher conceptions of pupil differences in communicative behavior and teacher expectation for pupil success in reading achievement.

The subjects of this study are 6 teachers and 180 pupils in grades two through four of a California elementary school. Pupils come from low income Mexican-American, Black, and Anglo families. Data will be based on pupil and teacher interpretations of videotaped samples of discourse in naturally occurring social situations (classroom, home, playground).

The results of this study could pinpoint some important causes of miscommunication in the classroom and identify ways to help teachers and pupils understand each other more fully, leading to improved pupil learning.

**Project**: Social and Cultural Organizations of Interaction in Classrooms of Bilingual Teachers

**Principal Investigators**: Frederick Erickson/Courtney Cazden

**Institution**: Harvard University

**Funding**: FY '78 - $95,293
FY '79 - $92,352
FY '80 - $10,000

**NIE Project Monitor**: Ricardo Martinez

---

This study seeks (1) to fill in the basic knowledge gaps about the social and cultural rules governing classroom interaction in bilingual first grade classrooms, and (2) to state clearly the implications for applying this new knowledge in the design and conduct of "culturally responsive" education for Chicanos and other bilingual populations. Data collection and methods of analysis will address currently unanswered questions about the cultural organization of social relationships in everyday classroom communication. During the first year, one first grade classroom will be observed and videotaped. It will be taught by a bilingual Latino teacher. During the second year, four classrooms will be observed and videotaped; two taught by Latino teachers and two taught by Anglo teachers.

A recent report published by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1973) investigated the interactional patterns of teachers with Mexican American and Anglo students in 429 elementary and secondary schools. The summary findings of this report clearly revealed that "typical" Chicano students have much less interaction with their teachers than do their "typical" Anglo counterparts. They show interesting variation but provide no evidence for the interactional causes of the variation. The investigators feel that such findings raises questions about more specific aspects of interactional dynamics in the classroom, e.g., What is the social and cultural organization of communication in these classrooms that produces these summary findings? What are the rules governing classroom communication? Do culturally distinct systems of social rules governing interaction patterns exist in linguistically and culturally heterogeneous classrooms? If so, what are some effects of such cultural differences in interaction rules on the participation of Chicano students in classroom activities?

Currently almost nothing is known scientifically about these issues. Yet they seem to have fundamental implications for the preservice and continuing training of teachers of bilingual children, whether those teachers are ethnically Latino or Anglo. The proposed research is an essential first step methodologically and substantively in addressing these issues of current significance in educational practice and in sociolinguistic theory.

**Project**: The Effect of Differential Classroom Organization on the Learning of Classroom Discourse Rules and Cognitive Content

**Principal Investigator**: Michael Cole

**Institution**: University of California, San Diego

**Funding**: FY '78 - $152,352
FY '79 - $158,258
Fy '80 - $169,788

**NIE Project Monitor**: Martin Engel

---

The purposes of this study are: 1) to apply currently existing techniques of examining discourse rules and cognitive content of elementary school children's behavior in a variety of classroom settings, 2) to evaluate the relative utility of competing methods of classroom interaction analysis for purposes of cognitive-linguistic description, 3) to use the best descriptions available to evaluate the theory that children from different home backgrounds are best taught in differently structured classroom environments, 4) to apply the fruits of this analysis to helping teachers learn more about the sources of children's misunderstandings in classroom lessons of various kinds.

The investigators will do an intensive study of the teaching and learning strategies of students and teachers in four basic kinds of educational settings which includes: 1) a general classroom lesson in which a single teacher presents material to a classroom full of students in a standard lesson plan format, 2) informal small group teaching in which the teacher and teacher's aide goes over the same types of lessons in a smaller, open corridor-type format, 3) an informal club activity in which the topics which have been taken up in the classroom are explored in very different contexts with groups of 7 or 8 children who have to work together to complete the projects which they helped design, 4) individual tutorial sessions with children from the same class conducted on different occasions by the classroom teacher, her aide, and a psychologist trained in clinical interviewing on cognitive skills.

The investigators' basic concern in this work is to establish links between the ethnographic and linguistic description of activities in the four different learning environments with cognitive - psychological accounts of the ways in which the children and the teacher process information about academic subjects and their social interactions. Their basic objective is to specify the way in which different kinds of social organization of classroom lessons interact with characteristics of the individual learner to produce different kinds of academic activities and outcomes.

The successful completion of this work should enable teachers to better design and evaluate the effectiveness of educational activities for a wide variety of children. It should also be of concern to social scientists interested in the description of cognition and language in context, educational theorists concerned with the design of classroom environments that are sensitive to the needs of different kinds of learners and teachers who must repeatedly deal with ambiguous information about the state of knowledge of their students.

CHAPTER III

MAJOR PAPERS

# A SUMMARY OF THE RESEARCH AREA: METHODOLOGY AND SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

Louis A. Gomes
1979

Paper prepared to summarize the presentations given at the National Institute of Education Conference on Teaching as a Linguistic Process, July 9-11, 1979, Fredericksburg, Virginia.

## INTRODUCTION

At a conference held in Fredericksburg, Virginia during July of 1979, investigators from eight research projects presented mid-project reports to their colleagues, outside experts and staff members of the National Institute of Education (NIE). The projects were funded in the 1977 NIE grants announcement competition in the area of Teaching and Instruction.

The first two days of the three day conference were devoted to individual project presentations. Written reports and oral descriptions of the research design, methodology, and preliminary findings of each project were delivered by each principal investigator. Following each presentation, a discussion period was held in which the audience raised questions, sought clarifications, made comments, and offered suggestions. On the final day of the conference two panels were organized to summarize the proceedings and to react to particular research issues. Panel One examined the implications of the research on educational practice while Panel Two* discussed the methodological and substantive research issues that surfaced as a result of the project reports.

This paper is an extension of the Panel Two discussion. In the first section of the paper a summary of the research area is presented. My method in this section is to present a broad, and necessarily cursory, description of the methodologies used by the research projects. I will summarize the research area while at the same time highlighting both the methodological similarities across projects and the unique aspects of each project's approach to the study of classroom discourse. To support the narrative discussion and to show visual comparisons, several tables are included for the reader's information.

A review of the substantive research issues raised during the conference and the response of the panel to these issues follows in the second section of the paper. The final section of the paper presents some concluding remarks about the research area and offers a few suggestions concerning the direction of future research activity.

### Summary of the Research Area

The original designation of the research area as outlined in the NIE request for proposals was for research on teaching as a linguistic process that would seek "to improve teaching at the early elementary school level through increased understanding of language use in school settings, including such

*Louis Gomes, Arno Bellack, Sylvia Scribner, Roger Shuy, and Judith Greene were the members of Panel Two.

factors as the nature and learning of classroom language rules, cultural difference in language use, and student and teacher interactions that require social and/or referential comprehension" (p.4). Three guiding questions were offered to potential researchers: (1) What is the nature of communication in the classroom? (2) How do students acquire the rules of classroom discourse? and (3) What are the effects of inadequate learning of classroom discourse rules?

All of the reporting research projects addressed, to some degree, the research area as outlined above. Research designs and strategies for collecting and analyzing data of all the projects were directed in various ways at the study and understanding of classroom discourse. Acquisition of classroom discourse rules and the effect of discourse rules on cognitive achievement were addressed to a much lesser degree.

A naturalistic "ethnographic" research design was used by all of the projects with the exception of Dell Hymes' survey of the approaches to classroom discourse (see Table I).* The Simons/Gumperz project, in conjunction with the naturalistic approach, utilized several field experiments in their design. One experiment developed by the project involved the study of children's behavior in a free-choice learning environment. A biology discovery room at the university was used as the experimental environment. In addition, the project team experimented with film as a method of eliciting oral and written narratives from the research subjects. Pilot testing of experimental tasks to measure metalinguistic skills and autonomous speech styles was also undertaken by this project team. The Tenenberg/Morine-Dershimer project and the Cole project were the two other projects using field experiments (curriculum changes) in their designs. The Cooper project was the only project to employ a laboratory experimental design. She used developmental psychology theory to structure an experiment in which she could study how children use language in cooperative and didactic learning tasks.

All of the research projects focused on classroom discourse of an academic nature while four of the projects (Attinasi/Poplack, Simons/Gumperz, Tennenberg/Morine-Dershimer, and Cole) included non-academic situations as well (See Table I).

Every project, except the Merritt project, focused on cultural variables. Only the Attinasi/Poplack study of Puerto Rican children dealt with bilingual populations. Sexual differences as a variable only appeared in the Cooper project. (See Table I).

Table II shows that all of the projects used naturalistic observation as a data collection method. Investigators in every project served as naturalistic observers while the Simons/Gumperz, Cooper and Cole projects used participant

*Tables I-IV were adapted from one developed by Virginia Koehler to describe common elements as well as differences among projects. The Hymes project will not be included in Tables II-IV since it is not an empirical study.

## RESEARCH DESIGN

| | PARADIGM | | | | TYPE | | | COMPARISONS | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Natl.-Ethno-Linguistic | Field Experiment | Laboratory Experiment | Synthesis | Academic | Non-Academic | Cultural | Bilingual | Sex |
| Attinasi/ Poplack | X | | | | X | X | X | X | |
| Hymes | | | | X | | | | | |
| Simons/ Gumperz | X | X | | | X | X | X | | |
| Cooper | X | | X | | X | | X | | X |
| Merritt | X | | | | X | | | | |
| Tenenberg/ Moring-Dershimer | X | X | | | X | X | X | | |
| Erickson/ Cazden | X | | | | X | | X | X | |
| Cole | X | X | | | X | X | X | | |

TABLE I

## DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUES

| | National Observation | Videotape | Audiotape | Interview | Questionnaire | Written Narratives | Oral Narratives | Existing Data |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Attinasi/ Poplack | X | | X | X | | | | X |
| Simons/ Gumperz | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | |
| Cooper | X | X | X | X | | | | |
| Merritt | X | X | X | | | | | X |
| Tenenberg/ Merine-Dershimer | X | X | X | X | | | X | |
| Erickson/ Cazden | X | X | X | X | | | | |
| Cole | X | X | | | | | | X |



TABLE II

DATA COLLECTORS

| | Naturalistic Observers | Participant Observers | Classroom Teachers | Parents | Children | Secondary Analysis |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Attinasi/ Poplack | X | | | | | |
| Simons/ Gumperz | X | X | | X | | |
| Cooper | X | X | | | | |
| Merritt | X | | | | | X |
| Tenenberg/ Moring-Dershimer | X | | X | | X | |
| Erickson/ Cazden | X | | | | | |
| Cole | X | X | | | | |

TABLE IIa.

observers. The Tenenberg/Morine-Dershimer research was unique because of the strategy of using same day video-playbacks and interviews as a means of involving teachers and students in the collection and analysis of data. This method provided them with a triangular scheme of data analysis in which the teachers and students provided the emic perspective while the research team provided the etic perspective.

Also unique was the use of parents as researchers and data collectors by the Simons/Gumperz project. In this project, parents were trained to keep diaries and to collect natural data by recording conversations occurring in their homes. This method enabled the project investigators to gather data on the discourse processes and quality of interactions taking place in the home.

Data was collected by various techniques in the eight projects. Audiotape recordings were used in all of the projects and all but the Attinasi/Poplack project used videotape recordings. Five projects (Attinasi/Poplack, Simons/Gumperz, Cooper, Tenenberg/Morine-Dershimer, and Erickson/Cazden) utilized interviews while only the Simons/Gumperz project used questionnaires to elicit data. The Simons/Gumperz project also used oral and written narratives as data sources.

Secondary analysis as a method of data collection only occurred in the Merritt project. She used existing videotapes and ethnographic records located at the Center for Applied Linguistics as her data base.

Table III shows that every research project focused on student-student and teacher-student interactions occurring in both small group and whole class social contexts. Parent-child interactions were observed and recorded in three projects. The Simons/Gumperz team, as noted above, studied naturally occurring conversations in the home. The Tenenberg/Morine-Dershimer group studied family conversations in black, Chicano, and white homes in order to gain some understanding of different patterns of language use in the home. Interestingly, they used this data to help teachers analyze the differences and similarities between home and classroom discourse. The Attinasi/Poplack group also studied parent-student interactions but they included the interactions within the larger social context of the community.

In Table IV we see that the primary focus of language analysis of every project was on the language used by the child. Teacher-speech was a focus of analysis in the Tenenberg/Morine-Dershimer, Erickson/Cazden, and Cole projects while parent speech and interactive behavior was included by the Attinasi/Poplack, Simons/Gumperz and Tenenberg/Morine-Dershimer projects in their schemes of data analysis. Community speech patterns were analyzed only in the Attinasi/Poplack project.

Table IV also indicates that every research project had a primary emphasis on the study of verbal communications and all except the Attinasi/Poplack

| | TYPES OF INTERACTIONS | | | SOCIAL CONTEXTS | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Child-Child | Child-Teacher | Parent-Child | Whole Class | Small Group | Home | Community |
| Attinasi/ Poplack | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Simons/ Gumperz | X | X | X | X | X | X | |
| Cooper | X | X | | X | X | | |
| Merritt | X | X | | X | X | | |
| Tenenberg/ Morine-Dershimer | X | X | X | X | X | X | |
| Erickson/ Cazden | X | X | | X | X | | |
| Cole | X | X | | X | X | | |

TABLE III

## FOCUS OF ANALYSIS

| | Child Speech | Teacher Speech | Parent Speech | Community Patterns | Verbal Comm. | Non-Verbal Comm. | Written Comm. | Receptive Channel |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Attinasi/ Poplack | X | | X | X | X | | | |
| Simons/ Gumper | X | | X | | X | X | X | |
| Cooper | X | | | | X | X | | |
| Merritt | X | | | | X | X | | |
| Tenerberg/ Moring-Dershimer | X | X | X | | X | | | X |
| Erickson/ Cazden | X | X | | | X | X | | |
| Cole | X | X | | | X | X | | |

TABLE IV

and Tennenberg/Morine-Dershimer projects included some form of analysis of nonverbal communication. Collection and analysis of written communication occurred in the Simons/Gumperz research and only the Tenenberg/Morine-Dershimer team studied and analyzed the interpretation of language through the child's receptive channel.

In sum, the research projects were similar in many respects but different in several other respects. Although ethnographix methods were utilized as a basic approach in every project, unique and interesting combinations of methods were employed in each project as it addressed its respective research problems. The use of these various approaches and methods led to the Panel Two discussion of the substantive methodological issues that follows in the next section of this paper.

## Substantive Methodological Issues

During the presentations of the mid-project reports several generic methodological issues of long standing emerged as investigators described the approach to their particular research problem. Questions concerning the generalizability and validity of research findings came up over and over again in each discussion period. The fact that the classrooms, as research environments, are constantly changing and have no permanency over time seemed to present a general problem to each project of how to specify and limit the multiple variables.

The question of the extent to which traditional ethnographic methods could be applied in classroom settings was another generic issue that was raised several times during the conference. John Ogbu, an anthropologist, on several occasions observed that many of the research projects were using modified ethnographic methods rather than the traditional methods and techniques of ethnography as understood by anthropologists. He viewed the methodology as applied ethnography and cautioned the audience about the potential problems in using such an approach. It seemed that the use of applied ethnographic methods were in part a response to the unstable nature of classrooms as a research environment and the ever present pressure to report findings as quickly as possible.

The discussion of ethnographic methods at the conference often led to the important question of who are the "researchers" and "ethnographers" in classroom research. The use of teachers as participant observers and as colleagues in the research process was debated throughout the mid-project reports. Some researchers argued that the teachers' perspective on the data was very important while others reminded the audience of the problems involved and the prior failure of action research. It was also mentioned that a dichotomy of purpose may exist because teachers were usually interested in solving problems and not methodology while ethnographers were often interested in process and method and not specific problems.

The concentration of the research projects on learning rather than on teaching was another substantive issue that was raised by several of the conference participants. Although this was a very valid assessment of the research projects, it should be remembered that the original focus of the research area was on the study of classroom rules and discourse. In any event, it is thought by some - but not others - that the research on learning was probably a necessary step prior to undertaking the study of teaching. As an aside, probably the title of the conference, "Teaching as a Linguistic Process", was not the most appropriate description of the type of research that was presented.

All of the above issues are very complex and to adequately address each issue would be beyond the scope and intent of this paper. Rather, it seems more appropriate to address the four substantive issues identified by the members of Panel Two. Those issues were: (1) necessity of using multi-disciplinary resources in classroom research and the problems involved; (2) the coding, cataloging and indexing of data and the potential for multiple analysis; (3) need to state underlying assumptions and to define research terms and concepts; and (4) study of teaching within the context of schooling.

The need and the acceptance of using methodological techniques and resources from other disciplines was evident in every research project. An example of this need was how the Cooper project in employing a psychological experiment needed a linguistic scheme for the analysis of language data. The Tennenberg/Morine-Dershimer project's use of psychological techniques to elicit data for the study of multidisciplinary resources. Members of the panel however, raised the issue of how researchers choose and select the appropriate resources for their particular research problem. The availability of information on different research techniques and organizing perspectives was felt to be scarce. Furthermore, several panel members observed that researchers were seldom fully cognizant of the problems involved in using or adapting a particular scheme of analysis or research techniques. This situation was, in part, responsible for the confusion and misunderstanding that occurred when the methodologies and the resulting data of particular projects were explained to the conference audience. On a positive note, the panel members were enthusiastic about the group research effort that was evident in each project. They applauded the new attitudes and appreciations that were being developed towards research methodologies from different disciplines. The type of data that was generated by these different methods was viewed as exciting by members of the panel.

Coding, cataloging and indexing of data was the second substantive issue raised by the panel. Coder reliability and validity in terms of what data was coded and by whom was viewed as one set of problems while the need for specific information on how data was collected and in what context was another. The fact that different theories and differences in methodological approach lead to how a particular research problem is defined and subsequently how data was viewed seemed to complicate how the coding of data could be made more reliable and valid. In addition, several participants

made the point that there was a need, because of expense and duplication of effort, to begin to consider the possibilities of sharing data and performing multiple analysis on already collected data. However, the sharing of data raised many procedural, legal and ethical questions that would have to be addressed before multiple analysis schemes could be implemented. Maintaining confidentiality, getting informed consent from participants and negotiating access to data were some of the obvious problems. Methodological concerns such as developing adequate coding systems, getting enough information to understand the social context of the data source, and receiving accurate language translations were some of the other problems that were stated. The initial step in the direction of data sharing, however, has been taken by each project by the thorough indexing and cataloging of its data. The intent of the Simons/Gumperz and the Erickson/Cazden projects to share computer data retrival systems is another step towards the development of data sharing methods. In addition, Erickson's catalog of audiovisual documentation of everyday life in school was offered as an available model for developing data sharing procedures. His catalog includes the following information: an index of major projects that have research data; an annotated listing of films taken in classrooms; a guide to filmmaking techniques and kinds of equipment; a procedure for getting access to films; and a discussion by teachers and administrators of their reactions to filmmaking in classrooms.

The third substantive issue raised by the panel was the need to specify and to clearly articulate the underlying assumptions that inform the methodology and approach to the research problem. Each project by its research design seemed to express implicit assumptions about classroom discourse and its relationship to the teaching and learning process. Assumptions concerning the effect of curricula, teaching methods, learning contexts, group size, teacher characteristics, and cultural behaviors as factors in the success or failure of children were often implied but seldom stated. In addition, in every project presentation questions arose concerning the definition of research terms and concepts. Terms and concepts such as setting, key episode, service-like events, ethnography, applied ethnography, personalization of instruction, language dominance and several others often required further definition and clarification. Although it may be important to spell out some of these terms and concepts in more detail, John Gumperz's position that terms, "in the interactive process, are ethnographic heuristics and not analytical primes" was instructive in emphasizing the aforementioned need to articulate the assumptions that direct the research process. It also serves as a caveat to the dangers of standardizing terms.

The final issue discussed by the panel was the study of teaching within the context of schooling. It was observed that classrooms are not isolated from the community. Such factors as the location, educational philosophy, population, and power relationships existing in communities, schools and classrooms may be important variables in the research process and the subsequent research results. Within classrooms, variables such as

curriculum, participant structures, teaching strategies, teacher characteristics, and student composition must also be considered along with other identified variables.

In sum, the panel brought forth the issue of the need for the research projects to bring the broader elements of schooling into their understanding of the classroom as a social context.

## Conclusion

Research projects reporting at this conference primarily focused on classroom discourse as the area of research. Language use in the classroom was studied from various perspectives and by various methodologies. The attention of the research effort, for the most part, was focused on the language of children as they interacted within the classroom setting. Emphasis on processes of learning rather than on teaching occurred in all of the reporting projects.

Methodologically, all of the projects used methods and resources from different disciplines in addition to traditional ethnographic methods and techniques. Innovative and exciting methodologies were developed in each research project. This occurred, in part, because the multidisciplinary composition of each research group brought different perspectives and subsequently different methodologies to the research process.

In terms of where to go from here, there seems to be a need for researchers to know more about the research methods and techniques utilized in each project. One way this could be accomplished was suggested by Sylvia Scribner. She said, "We can write up our work or document our work, having in mind, that one product that we can produce, perhaps, is to make our methods or techniques more available to other researchers." Perhaps, with the assistance of the National Institute of Education, each project could describe their methodology in a comprehensive document which then could be disseminated to present and future researchers. For example, Marilyn Merritt's application of secondary analysis techniques, Catherine Cooper's experimental design, Tenenberg and Morine-Dershimer's emic and triangular analysis, Erickson/Cazden's two case analysis of organizational and instructional contexts, Simons/Gumperz's multifaceted scheme of data collection, Attinasi/Poplacks community-school analysis and Cole's experiments with curriculum and social contexts could be documented and and made available to others.

NIE could also continue to develop other means of communication between and among researchers. Conferences around mutual methodological concerns such as data collection, coding schemes, systems of analysis, and methods of retrieving and sharing data could be organized to facilitate the intellectual dialogue between researchers and to improve the art and technology of educational research.

Finally, NIE could provide additional resources for researchers to examine how their data could be used to address other research problems and to explore how other researchers might benefit from using their data. Fred Erickson's catalog of research projects, the Simons/Gumperz -Erickson/ Cazden collaboration on computer retrieval systems, and the Hymes' synthesis project are potential models that could be used as a starting point toward achieving greater use of available data.

In sum, NIE has initiated eight innovative and outstanding research projects, but as everyone is aware, it is just a beginning. Further research effort and governmental support is required if we are to gain knowledge and understanding of the linguistic processes involved in learning and teaching.

# PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE RESEARCH

Marie E. Shiels-D'Jouadi

with comments by:

Hugh Mehan
Robert Carrasco

Paper prepared to summarize the presentations given at the National Institute of Education Conference on Teaching As A Linguistic Process, July 9-11, 1979, Fredericksburg, Virginia.

## INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to explore the practical implications of the research reported at the National Institute of Education Mid-Project Research Forum Conference: Teaching as a Linguistic Process, July 9-11, 1979, from the educational practitioner's viewpoint. The task of commenting from this perspective is difficult in at least two respects.

First of all, the term educational practitioner covers a multitude of roles, each of which implies different needs and different questions. The educational practitioner can be: the teacher trainer at the university level responsible for the pre-service of prospective teachers as well as the in-service and continuing education of experienced teachers; the person within the school district responsible for the in-service training of experienced teachers, e.g., supervisor, program specialist, building administrator, staff development provider; the curriculum specialist, supervisor, or assistant superintendent charged with the implementation of specific instructional programs on a system-wide or local building basis; the building administrator charged with implementing instructional programs within the context of a specific population of staff, students, and community; or the teacher charged with instructing. Each role brings with it a different set of questions or at least a different context for similar questions.

Secondly, the researcher and the educational practitioner frequently have different goals. Practitioners tend to approach research looking for clear statements of conclusion or generalization which they can apply in their educational role either on a pilot basis or in full implementation. Such a quest, however, is not usually in consonance with the view of the researcher who, fully aware of the tentative nature of his or her conclusions and their generalizability, is extremely cautious about making statements beyond his or her research.

Mindful of these difficulties, that is, the varied questions asked by educational practitioners depending on their roles, and the different goals of practitioner and researcher, this paper will examine each project presented at the conference, noting those areas of interest to the practitioner. The comments made do not reflect the perspective of all types of practitioners outlined, but most often are made from the viewpoint of persons responsible for the in-service of experienced teachers, persons charged with the implementation of programs administratively, and teachers in the classroom. The ensuing discussion is not confined to the main focus of the research project, but also identifies any side issues which seem to have practical import.

The first section of this paper discusses the practical aspects identified for each project. The comments specific to each project are to be used by the principal investigator as he or she deems appropriate, and must be read in the context of that project report and proposal. The fact that many areas of practical implication are noted for some projects while fewer are noted for others is not to be interpreted as a criticism of the research, but rather a comment on the limitations of the writer to reach beyond the reported research into the domain of educational practice. The second section of this paper contains general comments resulting from reflection on all the projects, and a third section summarizes comments from the panel discussion held at the conclusion of the conference.

## REVIEW OF SPECIFIC PROJECTS

"The View From Service-Like Events: Teaching as Managing Linguistic (/Communicative) Participation"

The mid-project report presented by Marilyn Merritt[1] studies the teacher's and student's management of linguistic participation in the classroom. This topic touches the very fabric of the elementary school day, in both the open and self-contained classroom. A prime element contributing to experienced and inexperienced teacher fatigue and frustration is the tension between wanting to minimize interruption and wanting to help each child as he or she needs it. Some of the practical implications of the research seem to be the following:

1. Classroom management is a topic that is often addressed in teacher training and is frequently named as a problematic area by teachers and administrators. The topic is elusive however and usually not discussed in anything but situation-specific terms. One component of classroom management includes the way the teacher manages his or her accessibility to individual students while working with other students. Such accessibility is attained through numerous unstated and implicit means.

Merritt's work indicates what appear to be five possible rules governing a child's success in gaining conversational access to the teacher in the classroom. Success is more likely if the child's approach:

a. is non-verbal only,
b. can be satisfied by the teacher non-verbally,

[1]Merritt, Marilyn. June 1979. "The View from Service-Like Events: Teaching as Managing Linguistic (/Communicative) Participation". Provisional final draft.

c. is made during the teacher's "down-time",
d. has not been preceded by numerous disruptions to the teacher's activity,
e. is made during a teacher activity more amenable to interruption.

These are tentative statements which will most likely be more clearly stated in the final report. Some generalizations like these would be most useful in studying and improving a teacher's classroom management. Teachers need to understand how communication is and can be regulated in their classrooms. They may then be guided toward alternative ways of managing such access and thereby achieving the balance between helping the individual child and being frequently "interrupted" by others.

2. One of the factors to be considered in deciding which students would profit from placement in an open classroom setting rather than a self-contained setting is the extent to which the child has internalized generally accepted discourse rules for conversational access and is able to infer rules specific to each classroom setting. Since conversational access needs to be negotiated less in self-contained settings, it is possible that those children who have difficulty inferring these rules should be placed in a situation where their immediate mastery is less important and where these rules can be "taught". An example of such a child may be one with limited English proficiency who is, for lack of English, unable to process most of the linguistic input at even a literal level without having also to discover how conversational access is obtained in a new culture and language.

Interesting questions related to this point are to what extent these classroom rules of conversational access apply across languages and cultures; to what extent discourse rules of conversational access are generalizable across classroom settings; what characteristics children share who are "slow" to learn the rules; and what the implications are of not learning the rules.

3. It would seem that there must be children who have not internalized the rules of conversational access operative in the classroom. For these children, it may be possible to "teach" the rules, provided that the rules are identified and that they are generalizable enough to be worth "teaching" so that a child can apply them across classrooms. Some teachers may be more skilled at regulating conversational access in a consistent manner, and hence may help students internalize these rules more quickly and effectively.

Unknowns underlying this suggestions include whether these rules are generally learnable, and whether there is an age threshold at which a child can more easily and readily acquire or infer rules governing conversational access in the classroom. Merritt's work will provide at least a tentative set of rules. It would be helpful if she could comment from her observations on the characteristics of children who seem to have mastered those rules as well as those who have not.

"Inter-Generational Perspectives on Bilingualism: From Community to Classroom"

The research reported by Poplack et al[2] addresses a very important question in bilingualism, that is, the role of children in transmitting and possibly transforming the linguistic norms of a community, and the role of the school and community in impeding or accelerating the transmission of these norms across generations. The proposal and report indicate the focus of the study is the effects of school and community, as well as participation in monolingual or bilingual programs, on children's language. Furthermore, the proposal notes specific strategies are to be recommended for curriculum development and training programs based on the researchers' data on the language skills and needs of the children studied. This first-year report, however, does not address these issues in detail. Nonetheless, the report indicates areas where practical implications could be drawn.

1. Poplack et al suggest that different kinds of code-switching occurs among their subjects depending on the speaker's fluency in both languages, i.e., tag-switching is favored by non-fluent bilinguals, while sentential and intrasentential switching is preferred by balanced bilinguals.

Such a finding may indicate a means of identifying balanced bilinguals by analyzing the type of code-switching used by the speaker, provided it is known to what extent these incidences of code-switching varieties are generalizable beyond this community of speakers. Whether or not this means of identification can be used as the basis for a formal assessment of bilingual proficiency would demand another kind of study. A further question to be considered is to what extent balanced bilingualism as identified by sentential and intra-sentential code-switching correlates with bilingual proficiency in the written domain of the languages, since school systems need to consider proficiency in all language skills when placing children in a bilingual program.

2. The writers note the importance of considering dialect characteristics of the language spoken by the community, e.g., Spanish, in planning bilingual curricula and language tests for native speakers of Spanish. This has long been a problem in bilingual programs, where the dialect of the teacher and/or curriculum does not match that of the students or their parents, so that in some cases students must learn another variety of their own language in addition to learning a second language. Two underlying problems seem to be how to determine and define the language variety of the student, and whether there exist instructional materials in that variety. If there are no instructional materials, then it may be necessary to teach a second variety of the students' language before instructional materials in that language can be used.

---

[2]Poplack, Shana, Pedro Pedraza, Alicia Pousada, and John Attinasi. July 1979. "Inter-Generational Perspectives on Bilingualism: From Community to Classroom". Center for Puerto Rican Studies: City University of New York.

It is not clear to what extent the research project reported by Poplack et al will provide data related to these concerns.

3. It can be assumed that the project's analysis of the linguistic, ethnographic, and attitudinal data for young children will give some indication of the impact of school bilingual programs on the transmission of linguistic norms and language maintenance in the community. This question touches upon one of the primary goals of many bilingual programs. In order to assess the impact of bilingual programs, however, it will be important to include among the variables studied the language proficiency of children when they enter the school program, and the kind of bilingual instruction provided in the bilingual classroom, e.g., while taught primarily in Spanish, does the bilingual classroom also include instruction in reading and writing skills in Spanish, or is the use of Spanish confined primarily to the oral domain? Is Spanish the medium of instruction or the object of instruction? These questions seem particularly relevant in "assessing the effect of formal educational process on language use and language change in a bilingual setting" (16).[3] It is hoped that Poplack et al will, by including such data, be able to make some observations regarding the impact of bilingual programs on linguistic norms and language maintenance which then can be pursued for other communities.

4. A very interesting byproduct of this study is the commentary on the inadequacy of the test used in the project school to place students in bilingual programs, i.e., the LAB test. While it is not the goal of this research project to identify ways of improving program placement procedures for bilingual students, it is hoped that the researchers will be very clear in their description of this test's inadequacies, and will be able to suggest alternative placement procedures based on the results of their research, e.g., code-switching abilities, dialect varieties, etc.

While this report is preliminary, the issues that Poplack et al raise have numerous practical implications. Some of these should be addressed in the remainder of the project in such a way that bilingual education practitioners will have some research information on which to base their program choices. It will be those sorts of statements that will give this study more practical impact than a descriptive ethnography developed in manual form for teachers. The major question of the impact of bilingual program enrollment on linguistic norms and language maintenance remains to be addressed in the next two years of the project.

---

[3]Unless otherwise stated, numbers in parentheses refer to pages from the reports submitted at this conference.

"They're All the Same in Their Own Way"

The research reported by Cole et al[4] addresses a crucial problem for practitioners. Aware that numbers of students are underachieving and that certain subgroups of students comprise a disproportinate number of these underachievers, administrators and teachers are engaged in a less than successful search for materials and teaching strategies to meet these students' needs. The Cole group seems to be addressing a more basic problem related to underachievement, that is, how different ways of structuring classroom events affect different children's learning, so that certain kinds of classroom organization are optimal for some children, while others are optimal for other groups of children.

Several aspects of this research have practical implications for educators:

1. The mid-project report indicates that the performance of the children studied depends in great part on how classroom events are structured, that is, what kind of task is presented, how the child's performance is elicited, in what order the child is called on, how large the group is in which the child is included, etc. Such a conclusion matches the educator's intuition, and the researchers have pointed to an aspect of teaching that is manipulable. To tell the practitioner that different children learn differently is in itself not helpful. To indicate that the way the instructional event is structured affects children's performance, on the other hand, is helpful since the practitioner can adjust the event for different groups of children and for individual children. This is particularly true for the elementary school teacher who is generally accustomed to providing a variety of activities for a number of groups.

Some questions must be addressed, however, before the practitioner can apply this research to the classroom, among them what the general characteristics are of children who perform better and less well, in each setting, and at what kinds of tasks. Assuming that Cole's research will indicate these general characteristics, two practical areas will be affected: teacher monitoring of children's performance, and the teacher's tailoring the task to the child. While many teachers monitor their students' responses and performance, such monitoring is most likely confined to the kind of product produced by the child, rather than the child's performance in relation to the structure of the classroom event in which the child is operating. Based on Cole's research, the teacher can improve his or her monitoring of a child's performance by considering the classroom setting and the nature of the required task as two factors that can be adjusted.

---

[4]Cole, Michael, Peg Griffin, and Denis Newman. July 1979. "They're All the Same in Their Own Way". San Diego: University of California.

With the information from the Cole study the teacher should be better able to adjust the instructional setting and task to the child. That is, if certain types of children perform better in a test situation when they are in a small group, in a one-to-one situation, or verbally rather than in written form, then the teacher, alert to this information, may be able to choose the testing situation appropriate to the particular child. At the very least, the practitioner will be assisted in knowing "what kinds of inferences about children's capabilities in what situations are warranted and what kinds of situational variability is plausible" (58).

2. The research report shows certain kinds of tasks have varied effects on different children, for example, turn-taking when the order in which a child is called on can influence both the information given by the child as well as its accuracy. The effect of turn-taking may vary depending on the characteristics of the child, for example, a child of limited English proficiency may be aided by taking a later turn, since he or she may benefit from hearing the syntactic patterns preceding his or her answer.

The kinds of questions asked also may favor one child more than another. The Cole report indicates that teachers viewing tapes made of their classes recognized this fact to some extent by identifying different kinds of questions, their co-occurence with parts of the lesson, and the differentiated ability of children to respond to these question types.

Some generalizations concerning the kinds of questions posed and the effects of the order of questions within the sequential development of the lesson would help teachers better analyze students' performance, more accurately estimate the child's capabilities, and more appropriately adapt the instruction to the child's needs. Cole's study should be able to provide some of these generalizations as the difficulty of varied tasks for different kinds of children is more thoroughly examined.

In general, therefore, the Cole research has extremely important implications for educational practitioners because of its focus on how the structure of classroom events influences the learning of the student. What is needed, however, before such research can be translated into practice is a set of clear statements outlining what kinds of students are affected in what manner by certain kinds of classroom events. It is hoped that such a set of statements will result from this research. Such a product would assist practitioners who suspect that classroom practises have much to do with why certain groups of students are perennially underachieving.

An objection that the researchers might well encounter concerns the nature of the curricular materials used in the research design. While carefully constructed to meet the demands of cognitive psychological research, the curriculum itself and the materials created to implement it are too simple and neat to resemble any sort of "real life" curriculum implemented in a classroom, and hence the results of the research are not generalizable to a classroom setting outside of the research environment. While the purity of curriculum materials is essential to this experimental design, it would be an added contribution to the knowledge of how classroom events influence students' learning were the research to include at some point some curricular materials presently used by school systems.

The practitioner would encourage the Cole research team not to lose sight of the very important implications their study has for teaching in the school setting: certain kinds of teaching events affect certain students in different ways. The more specific the research team can be on the "how", the more practical impact their work will have.

"Participant Perspectives of Classroom Discourse"

The Morine-Dershimer and Tenenberg research[5] addresses a phenomenon which is bothersome to many educational practitioners, that is miscommunication occurring in the classroom at the student's receptive level. The project report describes the researchers' initial findings concerning student perception of classroom discourse based on student report of perceived language units, and a comparison of these perceptions with student perceptions of discourse in home and play settings. The initial findings appear to have interesting practical implications for practitioners, some of which are the following:

1. There appears to be a shift in student perception of discourse as familiarity with the setting increases and the formality of the setting decreases. Students report more complex language units observed in the most familiar, i.e., family setting. Furthermore, the later it is in the school year the more complex units are reported. It is not clear what implication the perception of complex language units has for students' language perception, nor for any area of language performance, and this must be specified before the project information can become usable. However, if it is the case that student language capabilities, either receptive or productive, differ depending on student familiarity with the setting, then this has implications on teachers' expectations for student performance in language skill areas. For example, it may be preferable for language arts instruction to concentrate on simpler language units at the beginning of the year, saving more complex units for later. Secondly, in working with more complex units, teachers might do well to center discussion and writing topics on familiar topics in familiar settings when expecting students to produce more complex language structures. It would be interesting to see in what way language arts materials used by teachers follow this orientation.

Another implication of this shift in student perception is that expectations of student language use should be based on observations of student speech at play and in the home, where the degree of complexity in the child's language repertoire becomes most apparent. If the child uses few complex language units in these informal areas, then any expectation of the child's being able to use complex units in more formal settings is unrealistic and unproductive.

---

[5]Morine-Dershimer, Greta, and Morton Tenenberg. July 1979. "Participant Perspectives of Classroom Discourse". Hayward, California: California State University.

2. While grade level, cultural background, and reading achievement level appear not to correlate with a difference in perception of language use, peer status does. Such a finding highlights the importance of the social system in the classroom for language reception as well as production. As noted above, it is not clear in what way student report of language units and salient features as defined in this study relate to language reception, but if in fact they do, then the importance of peer status on language skills must be recognized by educators. Teachers should heighten their awareness of their students' peer status. Higher peer status should be fostered, not impeded, and students of higher peer status should be tapped as role models and peer tutors in language skill areas.

3. Morine-Dershimer and Tenenberg indicate their intent to study the speed with which students acquire rules of classroom discourse. Information on such acquisition would assist educators in forming realistic expectations of students' language reception and possibly production in class. It may be possible that a student's cultural and language background, for example, may affect his or her acquisition of such rules, so that a child of limited English proficiency, or a child dominant in a second dialect, may need a longer time to acquire rules of classroom discourse than standard English speakers. It is not clear from this report, however, how the authors intend to study speed of acquisition.

While these may well be some of the practical implications that can be drawn from this study, it is important that certain points be clarified by the researchers:

a. To what do the "rules of classroom discourse" discussed in this report refer? Are these rules generally followed and applicable in classroom settings? To what extent are these rules contextually based, that is, based on the nature of the particular classroom and teacher, or based on the grade level of the students, or based on the subject matter being taught?

b. In what way is student report of language units and salient features related to the same student's receptive capabilities? How is this related to the student's productive capabilities?

If these questions can be answered during the next two years of the project, and the areas of inquiry outlined in the project are pursued, it is likely that there will be further implications to be drawn from this study.

"Children's Discourse in Cooperative and Didactic Interaction: Developmental Patterns in Effective Learning"

The purpose of Cooper's[6] research is to identify the characteristics of effective and ineffective interaction among children in cooperative and didactic peer learning situations. In particular Cooper intends to specify developmental patterns of children's discourse in these learning situations, and make a comparative examination of various physical settings, role structures, and patterns of age, sex, and ethnic group differences.

In view of the fact that peer learning and peer tutoring have become increasingly popular concepts, Cooper's work should yield practical implications bearing on these concepts and on their implementation.

1. Cooper's report underlines the importance of encouraging peer learning situations which permit the interacting children to capitalize on their own skills when helping each other. Any kind of "training" of children to help others should simply reinforce the effective strategies children of that age tend to use. Based on Cooper's mid-project report, some effective teaching strategies of children appear to be:

a. kindergarten: the use of more descriptive information, accompanied by defining gestures, and the provision of step-by-step guidance to partners,

b. second grade: the use of a more elaborate orientation prior to the beginning of the activity, the use of explicit description, and active interest in their partner's comprehension of the instructions.

Ineffective strategies identified by the study are:

a. kindergarten: the provision of vague, inexplicit information, and preoccupation with the child's own activities rather than those of the partner,

b. second grade: the monitoring of their own state of understanding in the learner role.

Cooper suggests that peer learning activities "may be fruitful and feasible targets for oral language activities that could enhance children's learning in these grades". Indeed, it would seem useful to the practitioner if Cooper would, in her final report, summarize the effective teaching strategies observed by grade and age, i.e., kindergarten and second grade, so that they may form the basis for classroom, center, and individual activities designed for use in these grades.

---

[6]Cooper, Catherine R. "Children's Discourse in Cooperative and Didactic Interaction: Developmental Patterns in Effective Learning". University of Texas at Austin.

In addition, factors which affect children's teaching and learning in peer situations should be delineated, for example, the effect of ethnic group difference in peer teaching and learning situations by age level, the effect of sex, and the physical settings which are more appropriate for certain kinds of learning activities or certain participants. The more specific the information for each variable, the more useful.

2. Another observation which Cooper notes has implications for school learning is that "peer learning occurs in the context of a network of social or friendship relations". The extent to which a child participates in a peer learning situation depends, it would seem, on his or her network of friends and social relations, so that some children may benefit little, if at all, from peer learning activities simply because they are in contact with few other children. This observation is important since it is frequently assumed that in peer learning activities each child has many contacts. Research like Cooper's should encourage practitioners to take a closer look at their pupils' social network in the classroom and where needed provide some peer interaction for children lacking it.

3. Since much learning in the classroom occurs among peers, both formally and informally, particularly in the "open" classroom, Cooper's research can make a valuable contribution to practitioners by specifying how children effectively help other children to learn. It is important that Cooper indicate specifically what children's effective teaching strategies are. Further questions to be answered once the teaching strategies are delineated are: whether or not these effective teaching strategies can be taught to other children and what effective learning strategies of children in a peer situation are. Hopefully Cooper's final report will specify effective teaching and learning strategies according to the variables listed in her proposal, so that teachers can apply some of these findings at least to selected children in their classes.

"Language at School and Home: Theory, Methods, and Preliminary Findings"

The Cook-Gumperz et al report[7] addresses a crucial issue in education: the problem of differential learning in school, based on the discontinuity between home and school. The researchers intend to "utilize the ethnographic findings in conversational analysis to show how grammatical knowledge and knowledge of linguistic conventions combine with background knowledge and the understanding of goals in the interpretive process" (19). A substantive focus of this study is "the influence of children's language on their

---

[7]Cook-Gumperz, Jenny, John J. Gumperz, Herbert D. Simons. July 1979. "Language at School and Home: Theory, Methods, and Preliminary Findings". Berkeley: University of California.

acquisition of literacy skills", particularly the discontinuity between a child's oral language background and the written demands of school. Areas of practical implication can be summarized as follows:

1. Cook-Gumperz et al indicate that children tend to come to school from a home background where decontextualized speech is common and must then learn to adapt to an environment relying heavily on contextualized speech. Furthermore, the researchers indicate that individual and ethnic differences affect children's familiarity with these styles. An early task for the teacher therefore would be to design language arts instruction which would lead the child from his fluency in decontextualized (non-autonomous) language to fluency in autonomous language in order to survive in a non-home, non-familiar, i.e., school, environment. Ethnic differences as well as any other kinds of diferences which would apply to groups of children should be specified as the research nears completion.

2. The researchers were to concentrate their first year work on pilot testing instruments "to measure children's use of their metalinguistic skills and autonomous speech style" (25). If performance on these instruments meets the researchers' expectations by correlating with reading and writing skill, then perhaps such a task or series of tasks could be used by educators to determine children's autonomous speech style, their metalinguistic skills, and consequently their reading and writing skill. If it is important that educators help children acquire proficiency in autonomous speech style, and furthermore if there is a correlation between such proficiency and reading and writing skills such that language use influences school performance, then it is important that educators be able to ascertain their students' proficiency in these related areas.

3. The researchers' analysis of first grade sharing time indicated that certain children evoked a response in the teacher's speech which encouraged more topic-centered narrative talk than did other children. The children so assisted by interaction with the teacher were consequently being trained to produce more literate sounding accounts. The authors' report on the effect of cultural background on this type of exchange will be particularly important to educators working in bicultural and multicultural settings. It is hoped that this project's final report will describe specifically what effect various cultural backgrounds have on such exchanges as well as ways in which the teacher can adjust his or her response in order to encourage narrative talk from students of various cultural backgrounds.

4. Cook-Gumperz et al indicate some areas in which the black children perform differently than the white children in their study. Their observations have important implications for how classroom activities are structured and how the performance of different groups of children is evaluated by the teacher:

   a. Noted is the difference between the way the black and the white children respond to paper and crayon tasks: the black children tended to ask for assistance, although they were familiar with the tasks, with a characteristic prosodic

contour interpreted by the researchers as indicating a desire for company rather than an inability to perform. If further analysis indicates this is the case, then it would seem advisable to train teachers in pre-service and in-service activities to recognize such behavior and correctly interpret it so that teachers will not evaluate a child's ability on the basis of this performance.

b. In examining the cohesion of oral and written reports of fourth graders, this research indicates the tendency of white children to use prosodic cues signalling cohesion which are more readily translatable into written connectives than the ones occurring in the black children's speech. If the researchers' final report indicates that this is the case, then it is hoped the researchers can give some indication of ways in which teachers can structure oral work to emphasize the use of prosodic cues resembling written connectives to those in need of such instruction.

Observations like these noted here have important implications for classroom teaching, providing that Cook-Gumperz et al pursue them in the next stages of their analysis and report them in terms of linguistic generalizations. Their usefulness will be found in training teachers to recognize how children with different backgrounds vary in their behavior, this variation sometimes affecting performance ("thematic cohesion in oral and literary language") and sometimes not ("evaluating children's appeals"). Not only is teachers' understanding of different behaviors a goal to be achieved using the results of this research, but more importantly, instructional activities can be structured to take into account the factors outlined by this research. To the extent that the authors can suggest specific types of activities to meet the varied needs of identifiable groups of children, e.g., black and white, the results of this research can be more quickly assimilated into educational practice.

"Social and Cultural Organization of Interaction in Classrooms of Bilingual Children"

The research reported by Erickson et al[8] touches on some very important questions, particularly for educators working with a multicultural student population. Focusing on classrooms where many of the children are Spanish-dominant or bilingual Spanish-English, the researchers have three purposes:

(1) to learn more about the social uses of English and Spanish in pedagogical interaction and in non-instructional

[8]Erickson, Frederick, Courtney Cazden, Robert Carrasco. 1979. "Social and Cultural Organization of Interaction in Classrooms of Bilingual Children".

> situations, (2) to investigate the cultural organization of social relationships in routine instructional and noninstructional interaction in the classrooms, and (3) to determine the sociolinguistic repertoires of the teachers and of focal students (2).

The issue addressed, that is, the cultural organization of interaction between teacher and student in the bilingual classroom, has implications not only for the training of teachers in bilingual/multicultural settings, but also for bilingual program design as implemented in local school settings.

1. One of the fundamental questions addressed by this study is, given different repertoires on the part of teachers and of students depending on their cultural and language backgrounds, what are the varying ways in which these factors interact in the classroom? This question is often considered, at least implicitly, by bilingual educators in implementing a bilingual program design. It surfaces in the appointment and assignment of teachers, as well as the assignment and grouping of children, with little basis in research for decisions made. When completed, the results of this research may indicate that placement of students under the direction of a teacher who does not share the same sociolinguistic repertoire has adverse effects on academic performance, or, on the other hand, the results may indicate ways in which teacher and students accommodate to each other across sociolinguistic repertoires so that adverse effects are avoided.

An extension of this question which remains unaddressed concerns the interaction between students and teacher, when they share the same language but not the same cultural background, e.g., how is classroom interaction between student and teacher affected when the teacher is from Puerto Rico and the students are from Nicaragua or Bolivia? in what ways do the sociolinguistic repertoires of teacher and students differ and how does this affect academic performance?

2. The researchers note that the interweaving of instructional and non-instructional talk in Spanish and English differed depending on the subject content of the activity. Math activities, for example, seemed to permit more noninstructional talk than reading activities. It would seem then that one could expect increased interaction in the students' dominant language, e.g., Spanish, during math-like activities than reading-like activities even if the instruction in both is given in the second language, e.g., English. In structuring the day for bilingual program implementation, it may be the case, then, that interaction in subject matter such as reading will be in one language, perhaps the second, and subject matter like math which lends itself to more noninstructional interaction may be in the other language, perhaps the dominant.

3. Helping each other is reported as being encouraged by the two teachers observed. Quite chatting is tolerated, apparently because it neither halts nor appreciably slows the children's work. Erickson et al note that the distinction teachers often tend to emphasize between one child's work and the work of another is therefore blurred, as is the distinction between work time (instrumental) and play time (expressive). If in effect this distinction is being blurred, then teachers should be trained to look at classroom interaction without making these distinctions.

4. Both classrooms observed by the researchers were taught by Latino teachers and both avoided public competition in academic achievement. Cultural styles of interaction have frequently been grouped as competitive or cooperative. The second year of this study will include observation of two Anglo teachers. Analysis of both sets of classrooms in terms of competition may indicate a difference between Anglo and Latino teachers and the effect on the student's academic achievement. The results of this analysis may give some guidance to local school administrators in their decision on student placement. It may, for example, be more beneficial to students from Latino backgrounds to be placed with Latino teachers because of their shared avoidance of "audienced" competition.

5. Personalization of instruction by the teachers is noted in both classrooms. This personalization is shown in dyadic instructional encounters as well as in the large group context. Both teachers seem to treat the children familiarly and at least one bestows gestures of affection on the children through kisses, hugs, etc. Research on this project next year should indicate, by comparison with Anglo teachers, to what extent the observed personalization is culture-based, as distinct from simply personal differences, and to what extent it is applicable across cultures. If analysis shows that this type of personalization is part of the sociolinguistic repertoire of the Latino teachers, but not of the Anglo teachers, then the researchers should identify the affect on students across repertoires, i.e., what is the effect of the Anglo's teaching style on Latino children and on Anglo children? what is the effect of the Latino's teaching style? what cross-cultural adaptive mechanisms are used to accommodate persons, i.e., teacher, students, from other cultures?

The information gleaned from this avenue of inquiry will be pertinent to educators working in a bilingual setting, not only in providing a basis for assignment of teacher and students, but also in training teachers to recognize and adapt to other sociolinguistic repertoires than their own.

The questions posed by the project touch on the whole fabric of the instructional day for educators operating in a bilingual or multicultural setting and are as pertinent for settings where students already have considerable proficiency in English as for those where students have limited English proficiency. The extent to which the similarities between the two teachers is culture-based must be specified and the analysis between these and Anglo teachers pursued. Furthermore the interaction between teachers and students with different sociolinguistic repertoires must be studied to identify

what the effects of cultural differences in interaction rules are on the participation of Anglo and Latino children. Finally the researchers intend to answer questions about "how, linguistically and nonverbally, communicative functions are accomplished in interactional performance" (15).

Since the answers to the questions studied have considerable impact for educators concerning teacher assignment, student placement, and classroom management, it is hoped that the researchers will draw inferences from their data analysis that will provide educators with guidance in these problems.

## GENERAL COMMENTS

The preceding discussion outlined some of the practical implications to each of the reported projects, based on the mid-project papers presented at this conference and the submitted proposal. Not all of the implications noted were contained in either the report or the proposal. In fact, the degree of attention to practical areas varied from extensive in some of the research projects to minimal in others, despite promises in the original proposals.

Some of the research funded may be called basic, while other research here reported is clearly applied. The expectations for each kind of research should be made clear by the funding agency, and the research reports, in turn, should state their commitment to basic or applied research. In this way the basic researcher will not feel obliged to append some statements about practical implications that were not carefully considered within the context of the project, and the applied researcher, on the other hand, will not be let off the hook on developing practical implications from his or her work.

One area of concern is dissemination of research results, analyses, and implications. Some one or some group of professionals must make research results clearly stated, in a manner digestible by the practitioner, and available to those who can make best use of the results. The responsibility for such dissemination is shared between researchers and educators. Researchers have the responsibility for stating clearly and simply the results of their research so that educators will become aware of their studies, and understand them well enough to apply some of the results and recommendations to the program in which they work. Educators have the responsibility to communicate to other educators and to researchers the results from implementation of recommendations deriving from research studies. In disseminating research results to educators, researchers should know that their audience consists not only of teachers, but also administrators charged with the responsibility for program implementation and teacher training within each school system. These administrators communicate new information to teachers and other school personnel, and prepare program revisions to be implemented in the classroom. They can be reached often through conferences and publications of professional groups within the educational field, e.g., NABE (National Association of Bilingual Education), NASSP (National Association of Secondary School Principals), etc., through service networks, the LAU Centers, Title VII Dissemination Centers, the Teacher Corps Network, and through professional journals, e.g., THE KAPPAN, HARVARD EDUCATIONAL REVIEW,

TESOL QUARTERLY, etc. Such means of dissemination should be used more widely be researchers communicating the results of research on teaching and learning and its implications for practice.

What is communicated to educators by researchers must be carefully prepared. A description of observations, or a manual based on ethnographic observations, is not enough. Educators, especially teachers, are inundated with manuals and guides, many of which are not useful either because they prove not to be generalizable beyond the research setting or more importantly because educators need instruction and follow-through in the use of a manual or guide. Furthermore, it should not be assumed that educators are attuned to the same questions as an ethnographer, sociolinguist, or cognitive phsychologist. The question educators ask tends to be simple and important: what can be done to improve the achievement and self-worth of students within our instructional or professional responsibilities? Every piece of research in teaching and learning should attempt to answer this basic question.

Researchers such as those represented at this conference should be developing both individually and collectively the means for school people to better understand their students and adopt more effective instructional settings, strategies, and materials. The communication of these means should not be reserved only for formal teacher training programs, because new programs, strategies, and curricula are introduced regularly in school systems independent of formal teacher training programs. Rather results of research in teaching and learning should be communicated to educators in the field, particularly to those who, by their ability to effect change administratively, can make a difference in program design and implementation either at the local school or district-wide level.

From the viewpoint of bilingual-bicultural, or multilingual-multicultural education, an area of particular concern to school districts as they struggle to meet federal and state guidelines for educating students with limited English proficiency, the array of projects here reviewed leaves certain questions unaddressed. Some of these are:

a. the nature of second language acquisition in the school setting, and its relation to specific curricula, instructional program design, and kinds of instruction given,

b. the transferability of learning across languages, and the implications of transferability for program design and curricula,

c. the relationship of literacy in the first language to acquisition of the second language,

d. the characteristics of successful teaching of limited English proficiency students in the regular English-speaking classroom.

Finally it should be noted that although the grants announcement under which these projects were funded specified that attention be directed to the elementary school level, the questions addressed by these projects as well as the areas listed above are every bit as critical at the secondary and adult education level.

## PANEL DISCUSSION COMMENTS

Following presentations by the principal investigators of each project here reported, a panel discussion[9] explored the practical implications of the project. Their comments are here summarized.

There are two themes common among the projects reported[10]. The first theme can be seen in the trend to "study down", that is to concentrate on the least powerful groups within the educational society, students and teachers. The theme is one of implicit advocacy for these two groups, that children, particularly poor and "ethnic" children, are smarter than many commonly used measures show, and that teachers can both take greater responsibility for research within their classrooms, and, once aware of social interaction and language use in the classroom, improve their classroom organization and instruction.

A second theme seen among the projects is the "expansion of method" apparent both in the cross-disciplinary approach of the reported projects and in the inclusion of varied settings for study, rather than a single setting.

Allowing the teacher to function in the dual role of instructor and ethnographer has both advantages and disadvantages[11]. Involvement of the teacher in ethnography can improve his or her understanding of classroom dynamics and in this sense it is good. On the other hand, teachers' ethnographic knowledge of the classroom may be disadvantageous if the knowledge gained thereby adversely affects interaction.

---

[9]Panel members included: Mr. Robert Carrasco, Dr. Celia Genishi, Dr. Hugh Mehan, and Dr. Marie E. Shiels-Djouadi.

[10]Comments by Hugh Mehan. See Appendix 1 for text of comments.

[11]Comments by Robert L. Carrasco. See Appendix 2 for text of comments.

A similarity among the projects is the effort to properly reimburse cooperating teachers, schools, and school districts. Such reimbursement takes the form, in some cases, of providing substitutes, aides, or resource assistance for the participating classroom teachers. In other instances, field trips and teacher workshops were provided for classes and for teachers and school staffs. There was, however, a notable absence in focus on either effectiveness or student outcomes[12]. Teachers are concerned about effectiveness, i.e., what makes a difference in curriculum in instruction. Yet with the exception of Cole et al, there was no discussion of what content is taught within each project's purview, nor was there any discussion or intended analysis leading toward a recommendation on what content is more effective to teach, or how.

A second area notably absent from discussion was the matter of student outcomes, not in the sense of higher standardized test scores, but rather in terms of effective learning: what it is and how it happens. Both of these, however, seem to be high on the list of practitioners' concerns. To meet the needs of teachers and other practitioners, researchers must tackle the question of effectiveness by preparing a tentative set of generalizable statements at the conclusion of the study for the benefit of practitioners looking for ways to improve teaching and learning.

The panel concluded by offering recommendations to the National Institute of Education, funding agency and sponsor of the conference, among them:

a. that the National Institute of Education should unambiguously state, and then monitor, the degree to which research projects should extend their work to the realm of the practical, being careful to distinguish between basic and applied research in this regard.

b. That a clustering of projects be promoted so that where the area of inquiry and methodology are congruent, research efforts can be shared among several investigating groups.

c. that more responsibility be assumed by the National Institute of Education, particularly program specialists, for sharing with new projects the expertise and insight of National Institute of Education staff, review panelists, and previous researchers to avoid duplication of effort.

d. that the practice be instituted of convening similar review conferences in late summer or early fall, to provide investigators with the opportunity to gain insights from other projects working in the same research field.

---

[12]Comments made by Celia Genishi.

Finally, the panel, as well as the conference participants, expressed appreciation to the Teaching and Learning staff of the National Institute of Education for providing the opportunity to explore together common interests and concerns evolving in the presently funded research projects.

Appendix 1.

Comments

Hugh Mehan

1. A theme that I found through the studies reported at this conference, and a practice found in educational research in general is "studying down". Studing down implies conducting research on people less powerful than the researcher, and less powerful in general societal arrangements. Children are the least powerful contingent in the school system; teachers are the second least powerful. Yet, these two groups are the most studied.

There is a certain advocacy tied up in this practice of studying down. That is, there is a set of beliefs, often implicitly stated, sometimes explicitly stated, about children and teaching. The belief concerning children seems to be that they are smarter than some measures we have used have shown. This is particularly true of poor and "ethnic" children. Therefore, if children are observed in one situation (for example, a test or an experiment) and they "look dumb", we do not conclude that they are really "dumb". Instead, we observe them in other situations (classrooms, homes, streets). If they do well in these other contexts, we conclude that there is something in the nature of the organization of the situation not in the organization of the children's training that leads to the less desirable display.

The belief about the teachers seems to be that they can take greater and greater responsibility for teaching and research. This is a position that Hymes (1972) articulated as the teacher becoming an ethnographer of his/her own classroom situation. This theme has influenced the work of the Erickson group, the Shuy-Griffin CAL study, the Cazden-Mehan collaboration, and is readily apparent throughout the studies represented at the Fredericksburg conference.

I am a firm believer in this position, and have been trying to implement it in the preparation of pre-service elementary school teachers at ACSD. From Smith's talk, it is clearly a functioning principle at Penn's Graduate School of Education. Yet, we must be aware of the difficulties inherent in asking teachers to be teachers and researchers simultaneously. First of all, the teaching of students on a day-to-day basis is an overwhelming, consuming, experience. Teachers become caught up in the practical circumstances of curriculum organization, lesson planning, field trip scheduling. They embody everything that Shutz (1962) had in mind when he talked about people in everyday life being "practical theorists". By its very nature, research and particularly research influenced by the ethnographic tradition, is reflective and theoretic in orientation. It demands an immersing yes, but a distancing as well. These two "attitudes" (Shutz 1962)--"the attitude of daily life" and the "scientific attitude" may be incompatible, if a single person is asked to adopt them for the same period of time. An after-the-fact consideration of a year of teaching may be more possible than a demand for reflection on a daily basis (Cazden 1976, Florio and Walsh 1979).

Second of all, there is an implicit directive for social change in the teacher-as-researcher connection. If teachers become more and more aware of the structure of social interaction, and the organization of language, then they can organize their classrooms in a more beneficial manner. Notice that the emphasis is on the teaching learning process within the classroom here. But we must recognize the inherent weakness in the teacher's position. It is necessary, but not sufficient, to prepare teachers to be ethnographers of their classroom situation.

It does teachers a disservice unless they are prepared to deal with the organization of the classroom as embedded in the larger sociopolitical reality of the educational system.

2. A second theme running throughout the reports presented that has implecations for practice can be collected under the heading "expansion of method". NIE called for interdisciplinary studies; this call was heeded and heeded well. Not only is there ample evidence of collaborations of psycholigists, linguists, sociologists, and anthropologists, there are many representatives of methods derived from one discipline used in tandem with methods from another (e.g., description with experimentation; linguistic analysis with description; sociometrics with experimentation). This expansion of method seems to be driven by a concern for research problems. As problems are selected, researchers look for the most suitable method, instead of automatically assuming that the favorite method of their discipline can be used to address all problems.

This expansion of method is coupled with the technique of "providing variability". There are no single case or "one shot" (Campbell and Stanley) studies represented here. Researchers build contrasts into their studies (e.g., across contexts within the school-home-school-club, two or more classrooms in a school). The promise of this expansion of method is (1) a broader view of the teaching learning process, and (2) an approach that will enable us to get beyond the status quo.

Notice how the expansion of method and providing variability informs the idea (discussed above) that children are smarter in some contexts than they are in others. The implication of this line of investigation seems to be: if we know something about what kids do and think in and out of school contexts, and we import that knowledge into the school, then this knowledge can be used to the advantage of children.

While there is great promise for more culturally responsive education in informed linkages between home and school, we must be aware of the unintended negative consequences of importing children's culture into the school. To re-sound a theme introduced at the 1978 NIE/RBS conference (see Gilmore and Glatthorn 1979 for proceedings), this importation can result in another form of cultural imperialism. Knowledge of children's culture becomes yet one more tool of oppression.

Cazden, Courtney B., 1976. How Knowledge About Language Helps the Classroom Teacher--Or Does It? The Urban Review 9: 74-90.

Cazden, Courtney B. and E.L. Leggett. 1979. Culturally Responsive Education: Recommendations for Achieving Lau Remedies. In: Henry T. Trueba, Grace Pung Guthrie and Kathryn Hu-Pei Au (eds) Culture and the Bilingual Classroom: Studies in Classroom Ethnography. Newberry House.

Florio, Susan and Martha Walsh. 1979. The Teacher as Colleague in Classroom Research. Also in Trueba et al.

Gilmore, Perry and Alan Glatthorn (eds). 1979. Ethnography and Education: Children in and out of Schools. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hymes, Dell. 1972. Introduction. In: Courtney B. Cazden, Vera John and Dell Hymes (eds). Functions of Language in the Classroom. New York: Columbia University Press.

Shutz, Alfred. 1962. Collected Papers I: The Problem of Social Reality. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Appendix 2.

Comments

Robert L. Carrasco

The argument has been made that it might be profitable for a teacher to become an "ethnographer" of his or her own classroom. We should examine the implications of what is meant by this. Ethnography, classically conceived, is a description of culture where culture has been implied as a holistic consideration of a cultural group or society. As this meeting, we have been talking about schools and classrooms, and therefore, we really cannot make an exact parallel between school/classroom and culture if we follow John Gumperz's position that schools/classrooms should not be referred to nor considered as "cultures". If we cannot make this parallel then we must agree with Spradley and McCurdy (1972) who say that we can trade off the ethnographic method to study social situations. They define "social situations":

> A social situation is made up of persons, their interactions, a place or location, and objects. A fifth-grade classroom is a social situation made up of people who are acting vis-a-vis one another. They are located in a particular place that includes a variety of objects such as desks, chalk, and books (p.27).

The school is a social situation and it does take "knowledge" by the teacher and students as participants to get through those recurrent situations. In the Goodenough (1971) sense of the term, "knowledge" is what a person needs to know and do to communicate and perform effectively and appropriately in a significant setting. Therefore, what school ethnography is doing is looking at the social aspects and the cognitive aspects in these situations--knowing and doing. And this seems like a good thing to do.

There is some evidence that this approach is useful. Hugh "Bud" Mehan and Frederick D. Erickson report, for example, that when they have given pre-service and in-service workshops for teachers on this type of research, that one of the things teachers say is "Your videotape....it resonates with the way I've taught my classroom. I did'nt have a way of talking about it before but now I have a vocabulary and an 'extra' eye for understanding what's going on in my classroom" (personal communication during the conference). So while this type of research can reveal to teachers what they already know, it helps make explicit the subtle, tacit, implicit, or hidden culture. To surface it leads to better understanding of what one is doing. This is one thing classroom ethnography can do.

Another thing it can do is the kind of thing Carrasco (1979) and Florio (1978) have experienced. They pointed out to teachers things they did not know about their classrooms and now they see their classrooms in a different more positive way. However, we have got to be cautious here because one of the things that could happen is that by pointing out classroom "things" to teachers, teachers could use that knowledge to the disadvantage of children in those situations. Moreover, it is possible that ethnographic knowledge can exploit children's culture. The things that are going on between children in peer relationships away from the teacher (that the teacher may not be aware of.... and maybe teachers should not be aware of) are part of a variety of things that make up the classroom, and it may very well be that these out-of-teacher-awareness peer relationships are the things that make children go to school or simply make kids "go".

To come right to the point, there are some things that perhaps teachers should not be aware of and these pieces of knowledge as surfaced by classroom ethnographers may be best left intact and implicit to the teacher. So I suggest that we must be careful not to turn the spotlight on too much, for what we as social scientists may consider "knowledge for potential practical application of research, may differ when this knowledge is presented to teachers who in turn see other "unknown" applications. This we must consider before we take the teacher on to the ethnographic road.

Teachers have complained that researchers walk into their classrooms, take data, and leave nothing in return. If a classroom ethnographer is to perform a "good" ethnography, then the trusting relationship between the teacher and researcher must be established and maintained before, during and after observation and data collection. And these relationships must be more than simply "professional" relationships; they must also be "personal" relationships established by teacher and researcher. Professional relationships, if maintained over time, dwindle and weaken as researchers fail to provide feedback--knowledge found in the field--and is so provided, it is usually too late for immediate practical use and implementation. The teacher, therefore, loses confidence in the effort and the enthusiasm is shattered. Some researchers whose long projects do not allow immediate feedback capabilities, such as "Social and Cultural Organization of Interaction in Classrooms of Bilingual Children" (Erickson, Cazden, and Carrasco), have found it necessary to go beyond the professional relationship to the personal relationship. This group of researchers found that professional relationships would not sustain themselves over time. They sensed that spending long periods of time "in their territories" (classrooms), the professional relationship begun would cause the delicate and necessary trust between their teachers and themselves to deteriorate. Being able to "sense" this, the researchers went beyond "professionalism" and switched hats. One researcher became a math resource for the teacher since he had been a math advisor early in his career. This same researcher also took time to take the teachers to lunch, dinner and sometimes just for a few cocktails. While some people may think that this is unprofessional, it is very fruitful in the maintenance of research relationships, and in the long run the researcher has also acquired another "friend". Another researcher, known by the teachers as an expert in child language (Cazden), also switched research hats and gave mini-seminars on child language over breakfast, lunch and dinner with the teachers. These mini-sessions really turned out to be "getting to know each other" sessions where personal relationships were established.

Most likely there have been other such "unreported" efforts (probably because government agencies do not regard such affairs as business). Researchers are dealing with people who deal with other people and cannot treat people like machines. We all have feelings and researchers should not be afraid to reveal them in the establishment of personal relationships with other professionals. There are some reported efforts (because they are officially allowed) that consider the teacher-researcher relationship, for example the provision of a substitute teacher or aide. While these efforts may seem like a mild form of "pay off", and they could be if the teacher senses insincerity in the effort, they are very beneficial and should be a necessary part of the research process, since this research does not necessarily end once the data is collected. The knowledge--more accurate knowledge--can only come from the main participant--the teacher.

We may say that there are two major benefits from classroom ethnography: (1) we gain more knowledge toward the betterment of the educational process, and (2) we gain more friends.

# CHAPTER IV: RESEARCH PERSONNEL

## PAPER PRESENTERS

Dr. Marilyn Merritt
Center for Applied Linguistics
1611 North Kent Street
Arlington, Virginia 22209
(703) 528-4312

Dr. John Attinasi/Dr. Shana Poplack/Dr. Pedro Pedraza
Center for Puerto Rican Studies
445 West 59th Street
New York, New York 10019
(212) 489-5263

Dr. David Smith
Graduate School of Education
University of Pennsylvania
3700 Walnut Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104
(215) 243-7014

Dr. Herbert Simons/Dr. John Gumperz/Dr. Jenny Cook Gumperz
School of Education
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720
(415) 642-0746, 642-0747

Dr. Catherine R. Cooper
Dept. of Home Economics
University of Texas at Austin
Mary E. Gearing Building 115
Austin, Texas 78712
(512) 471-4684

Dr. Frederick Erickson
Institute for Research on Teaching
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824
(517) 355-9603

Dr. Courtney Cazden
Center for Advanced Study in
the Behavioral Sciences
202 Junipero Serra Boulevard
Stanford, California 94305
(415) 321-2052

Dr. Michael Cole
Center for Human Information
Processing
The University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, California 92093
(714) 452-4410

Dr. Morton Tenenberg
Dept. of Teacher Education
California State University
Hayward
Hayward, California 94542
(415) 881-3027

Dr. Greta Morine-Dershimer
4548 Richmond Avenue
Freemong, California 94536
(415) 793-4934

## PANEL MEMBERS

Dr. Louise Cherry Wilkinson
Department of Educational Psychology
University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 West Johnson Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53704
(608) 262-0836

Dr. Carol Reed
Department of English
2307 Boylan Hall
Brooklyn College, CUNY
Bedford Avenue at Avenue H
Brooklyn, New York 11210
(212) 780-5518

Dr. Arnulfo Ramirez
Center for Educational Research at Stanford
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305
(415) 497-3807

Dr. John Ogbu
Department of Anthropology
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720
(415) 642-1182

Dr. Rebecca Barr
5835 South Kimbark Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637
(312) 753-3846

Dr. Peg Griffin
Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, California 92093
(714) 452-4410

Dr. Arno A. Bellack
Box 25
Teachers College, Columbia University
525 West 120th Street
New York, New York 10027
(212) 678-3762

## OUTSIDE EXPERTS

Dr. Marie Shiels D'Jouadi
ESOL/Bilingual Curriculum Specialist
Arlington Public Schools
1426 North Quincy Street
Arlington, Virginia 22207

(703) 558-2091

Dr. Louis Gomes
268 North Street
New Bedford, Massachusetts 02740

(617) 999-4820

Dr. Roger Shuy
8119 Thoreau Drive
Bethesda, Maryland 20034

(703) 528-4312

Robert Carrasco
Human Development Laboratory
Harvard University
Room 501, Larsen Hall
Appian Way
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

(617) 429-4754

Dr. Judith Lee Greene
1342 Stratford Drive
Kent, Ohio 44240

(216) 672-2656

Dr. Harold Mehan
Center for Human Information Processing
The University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, California 92093

(714) 452-2957

Dr. Joan Baratz
Educational Testing Service
1527 New Hampshire Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 234-3502

Dr. Sylvia Scribner
CAL
1611 North Kent Street
Arlington, Virginia 22209

(703) 528-4312

Dr. Jenny Cook-Gumperz
School of Education
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

(415) 642-2677

Dr. Celia Genishi
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712

(512) 471-4089



GPO 866 663